R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 003 412 24

EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND A REAPPRAISAL OF THE PROCESS OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT.

BY- REQUA, ELOISE THOMASINE, SISTER M.
LIBRARY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, CHICAGO, ILL.

REPORT NUMBER CRP-F-042 PUB DATE 64
ROSARY COLL., RIVER FOREST, ILL.
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.18 HC-$2.48 62P.

DESCRIPTORS- *CONFERENCES, *EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, *ECONOMIC RESEARCH, *SOCIAL PROBLEMS, DEPRESSED AREAS (GEOGRAPHIC), *DEVELOPING NATIONS, HUMAN RESOURCES, DISCUSSION GROUPS, INTERDISCIPLINARY APPROACH, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

A CONFERENCE WAS HELD TO PROVIDE 30 PARTICIPATING SCHOLARS AN OPPORTUNITY TO DISCUSS THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS OF UNDERDEVELOPED NATIONS IN RELATION TO EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH. THE THIRD IN A SERIES OF BIENNIAL CONFERENCES, IT POOLED INTERDISCIPLINARY RESOURCES FOR REAPPRAISAL OF THE MOST RECENT FINDINGS, AND PROVIDED THE ATMOSPHERE FOR AN EXCHANGE OF KNOWLEDGE AND VIEWPOINTS. SOME OF THE CONCLUSIONS DRAWN WERE THAT THE ROLE OF EDUCATION IN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IS NOT PROPERLY UNDERSTOOD, THAT DISCUSSION BETWEEN PROFESSIONAL EDUCATORS AND SOCIAL SCIENTISTS IS OF EXTREME VALUE IN APPROACHING THESE PROBLEMS TO MAKE RESEARCH MORE BALANCED AND TIMELESS IN CHARACTER, AND FUTURE RESEARCH SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED. (RS)

NCE
Y
ATIVE
CH
M
042

EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND A REAPPRAISAL OF THE PROCESS OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Cooperative Research Project No. F-042

Library of International Relations
Chicago, Illinois

and

Rosary College
River Forest, Illinois

1964

The research reported herein was supported by the
Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education,
U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Educational Research and Economic Development: A Conference.....	1
Objectives	2
Related Research	3
Procedure and Program of the Conference	5
Analyses of the Data and Findings: Selected Excerpts from the Proceedings of the Conference	
Unemployment in Developing Areas - Introduction and Part I of paper by W. Arthur Lewis and excerpts from the discussion that followed, quoting Leonard Binder, George Blanksten, Mr. Lewis and Manning Nash	11
Economic Growth in Newly Settled Areas As Contrasted with Old Settled Areas - Presented by Theodore Morgan, excerpted with examples of discussion that followed, quoting C. Arnold Anderson, Manning Nash, and Frank H.H. King ...	21
Perspectives for Cooperative Research - Introductory paragraph of the Chairman, Philip Haring, excerpts from the presentation of the subject by C. Arnold Anderson, and examples of the discussion that followed, quoting Theodore Morgan and Mr. Anderson	31
Conclusions and Results: Comments of Participants	37
Jack Baranson, Indiana University Mordechai E. Kreinin, Michigan State University Hugh H. Schwartz, The University of Kansas Hal Serrie, Beloit College	
James B. Hendry, Michigan State University H. Murray Herlihy, Lake Forest College Marvin P. Miracle, The University of Wisconsin Theodore Morgan, The University of Wisconsin	
A. A. Fatouros, Indiana University Philip S. Haring, Knox College Frank H. H. King, The University of Kansas Raymond L. Randall, Indiana University	
Appendices	
Advisory Committee	53
Biographical Notes on Participants	54

ED003412

EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT: A CONFERENCE

This Developmental Activities Program was a three-day conference on the subject, Educational Research and a Reappraisal of the Process of Economic Development. It was sponsored jointly by the Library of International Relations and Rosary College in cooperation with the U.S. Office of Education.

The Conference was held in Chicago October 30 - November 1, 1964. Twenty-eight (28) scholars from 15 institutions in six Midwestern states and one Eastern state (New Jersey) participated.

Each of these scholars has been engaged in research in underdeveloped areas and represented the following disciplines:

Agricultural Economics	Geography
Anthropology	Law
Economics	Political Science
Education	Sociology

The Conference aimed to define some of the most significant development problems and to evaluate the approaches which had been made to solutions. The subjects discussed included: unemployment in developing areas, the position of underdeveloped countries in the world economy, the problems of development within the context of international politics, economic growth in newly settled areas, and cultural change in development. The Conference concluded with a consideration of the perspectives for cooperative research with emphasis on education. Several of the participants came directly to the Conference from research projects in which they were engaged abroad. Others proceeded abroad immediately afterwards. This factor, combined with the inter-disciplinary character of the discussions, stimulated intensive examination of a variety of problems of research on the process of economic development.

OBJECTIVES

The Conference was the third in a series of biennial conferences conducted under the auspices of the Library of International Relations on the general topic of educational research on underdeveloped areas. The overall objectives of these conferences have been:

1) to stimulate educational research and teaching concerning the problems of underdeveloped countries on the part of promising younger scholars working in the disciplines involved on the faculties of the smaller colleges and of the large universities of the Middle West, as well as to make known the potential of these younger men,

2) to gain new perspectives for such research through interdisciplinary discussion of investigations in progress,

3) to provide an opportunity for faculty members of smaller colleges to meet the outstanding scholars of larger institutions for discussion in an informal atmosphere conducive to a meaningful exchange of knowledge and viewpoints.

The specific objective of this third Conference was to reappraise the most recent findings of educational research on the process of economic development as it involves various related disciplines, particularly by drawing upon scholars fresh from research abroad, and by:

1) Acquainting the conferees with pertinent research knowledge and data newly available.

2) Providing an interpretation and evaluation of the findings under the guidance of experts in the disciplines concerned.

3) Determining in the light of the above, the directions toward which future educational research can most profitably be orientated.

RELATED RESEARCH

Research materials related to the subject of the Conference are of two types. One emphasizes the economic factors, and the other, the non-economic factors that affect the process of economic development. The number of publications of both types was precisely one of the reasons for holding the Conference to reappraise the methods and to consider the theories advanced. The following works are representative of existing studies.

Economic Studies

Historical Analyses

Gerschenkron, Alexander. Economic Backwardness in Historical Perspective (Harvard University Press, 1962)

Levin, Jonathan V. The Export Economies: Their Pattern of Development in Historical Perspective (Harvard University Press, 1960)

Youngson, A. J. Possibilities of Economic Progress (Cambridge University Press, 1959)

Economic Theory

Bauer, P.T. Economic Analysis and Policy in Underdeveloped Countries (Duke University Press, 1957)

Harrod, Roy. Essays on the Theory of Growth (Oxford University Press, 1957)

Hoselitz, B. F. and others. Theories of Economic Growth (The Free Press, 1960)

Leibenstein, Harvey. Economic Backwardness and Economic Growth (Wiley, 1957)

Lipton, Michael. "Balanced and Unbalanced Growth in Underdeveloped Countries", The Economic Journal, Sept., 1962, pp. 641-647.

Policy and Case Studies in Development

Hirschman, Albert O. Journeys toward Progress (Twentieth Century Fund, 1963)

Kuznets, Simon. Economic Growth: Brazil, India, Japan (Duke University Press, 1955)

Malenbaum, Wilfred. East and West in India's Development (National Planning Association, 1959)

Meyer, A. J. The Economy of Cyprus (Harvard University Press, 1962)

Saigh, Yusuf 'Abd Allah. Entrepreneurs of Lebanon; the role of the business leader in a developing economy (Harvard University Press, 1962)

Annotated Bibliographies

Hazlewood, Arthur, compiler. The Economics of Underdeveloped Areas; an annotated reading list of books, articles and official publications (Oxford University Press, 1962)

Annotated Bibliographies (Cont.)

Library of International Relations. The Developing Nations; a guide to information sources (Gale Research Company, 1965)

Trager, Frank N. "A Select and Annotated Bibliography on Economic Development," Economic Development and Cultural Change, July, 1958, pp. 257-359.

Proposals for Research

The Brookings Institution. Development of the Emerging Countries; an agenda for research (Washington, D.C., 1963)

Higgins, Benjamin. "Proposals for Research," Economic Development: Principles, Problems and Policies (W. Norton, 1959), pp. 766-774.

Non-economic Studies

Geographical Aspects of Growth

Marshall, Anthony D. "Tanganyika", Focus, June, 1962, pp. 1-6.

Robinson, K. W. "Process and Patterns of Urbanization in Australia and New Zealand," New Zealand Geographer, April, 1962, pp. 32-49.

Political Factors of Growth

Haeflin, Ulrich. "Democracy in the Developing Countries," Review of World Affairs, August, 1962, pp. 11-13.

Mair, Lucy P. New Nations (University of Chicago Press, 1963)

Socio-cultural Aspects of Growth

Banfield, E. C. and L. E. Banfield. Moral Basis of a Backward Society (The Free Press, 1958)

Braibanti, Ralph and J. J. Spengler. Tradition, Value and Socio-Economic Development (Duke University Press, 1961)

Coale, Ansley J. Population Growth and Economic Development in Low Income Countries (Princeton University Press, 1958)

Hagen, Everett E. On the Theory of Social Change: How Economic Growth Begins (Dorsey Press, 1962)

McClelland, David C. The Achieving Society (Van Nostrand, 1961)

Annotated Bibliographies

Committee for Social Science Documentation. International Bibliography of Political Science, 1962 (Tavistock Publications and Aldine Publishing Co., 1963)

Gilfallen, S. C. and A. B. Stafford, "Social Implications of Technical Advance," Current Sociology, (Paris, 1953), pp. 187-266.

Stanford Research Institute. International Development Center. Human Resources and Economic Growth; an international annotated bibliography on the role of education and training in economic and social development (Stanford Research Institute, 1963)

PROCEDURE AND PROGRAM OF THE CONFERENCE

The Conference was held on October 30, 31 and November 1, 1964 in Chicago. 28 scholars from 15 institutions in six (6) Midwestern states and one (1) Eastern state (New Jersey) participated.

Selection of participants was made by the Conference Advisory Committee composed of:

Chairman
Philip M. Hauser
Department of Sociology
University of Chicago

Secretary
Eloise ReQua
Director
Library of International Relations

Leonard Binder
Department of Political Science
University of Chicago

George I. Blanksten
Department of Political Science
Northwestern University

Wesley Fishel
Department of Political Science
Michigan State University

Norton S. Ginsburg
Department of Geography
University of Chicago

Bert F. Hoselitz
Research Center on Economic Development and Cultural Change
University of Chicago

George J. Stolnitz
Department of Economics
Indiana University

Sister Thomasine
Department of Economics
Rosary College

Andrew Whiteford
Department of Anthropology
Beloit College

The Committee selected the conferees from several points of view: 1) geographic area of specialization; 2) subject field; 3) size and location of their institutions; 4) age and experience, in order to achieve a broad-gauge discussion of the problems and to encourage the exchange of ideas between the younger men and outstanding scholars.

Participants represented the following disciplines:

Agricultural Economics	Geography
Anthropology	Law
Economics	Political Science
Education	Sociology

All conferees participated in all sessions. The keynote address was made

by W. Arthur Lewis and followed by discussion by all the conferees.

The topic of each subsequent session was introduced by a ten-minute statement by the discussion leader, followed by five-minute commentaries by two discussants of different disciplines. The session was then opened to general discussion.

The program, which included the list of participants, is attached.

A stenographic record was made of all meetings and a transcript of the entire proceedings is being published. Excerpts of the forthcoming Proceedings are included in the next section of this report.

THIRD BIENNIAL CONFERENCE ON RESEARCH PROBLEMS IN UNDERDEVELOPED AREAS

EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND A REAPPRAISAL OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

October 30 - November 1
1964

sponsored by the

LIBRARY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

and

ROSARY COLLEGE

in cooperation with the

U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

The purpose of these conferences is to provide an opportunity for cross-disciplinary discussion of research problems related to economic and social development in emerging nations. Participation is limited to 25 scholars, in addition to the Advisory Committee, who have done work in the field and who are teaching in Middle Western academic institutions in departments of anthropology, economics, education, geography, law, political science and sociology.

MIDWEST RESEARCH CONFERENCE
ON
EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND A REAPPRAISAL OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
October 30 - November 1, 1964

Program

ay, October 30

gistration 9:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.	Conferees are invited to browse in the	Library of International Relations, 660 N. Wabash Avenue
ncheon 2:30 p.m.	Honoring W. Arthur Lewis Professor of Economics and International Affairs Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs Princeton University	Rosary College River Forest, Illinois
	Welcome to the Conference Sister Thomasine	
nner 6:00 p.m. aperitifs	Introductions and Informal Discussion	The Kungsholm 100 East Ontario Street
rst Session 7:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m.	Unemployment in Developing Areas Chairman - George I. Blanksten, Conference Chairman Keynote address - W. Arthur Lewis	The Kungsholm

rday, October 31

cond Session 9:00 a.m. to 12 noon	Underdeveloped Countries in the World Economy Chairman - Leonard Binder Discussion Leader - Karl de Schweinitz, Jr. Discussant - Andrew Whiteford Discussant - Raymond L. Randall	Library of International Relations
ncheon 2:30 p.m.	Informal Discussion	The Arts Club 109 East Ontario Street

ALL CONFERENCE MEMBERS PARTICIPATE IN ALL SESSIONS

day, October 31 (cont.)

rd Session :30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.	The International Politics and Diplomacy of Development Chairman - George Blanksten Discussion Leader - Robert T. Holt Discussant - A. A. Fatouros Discussant - Mordecai Kreinin	Library of International Relations
ner :00 p.m. aperitifs	Informal Discussion	Chez Paul 660 N. Rush Street
rth Session :30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m.	Economic Growth in Newly Settled Areas as Contrasted with Old Settled Areas Chairman - James B. Hendry Discussion Leader - Theodore Morgan Discussant - ~~John Augelli~~ Scott D. Johnston Discussant - Jack Baranson	Library of International Relations

y, November 1

th Session :30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.	Cultural Change in Development Chairman - Frank H. King Discussion Leader - Manning Nash Discussant - Daniel Wit Discussant - Edward E. Werner	Library of International Relations
cheon :45 p.m.	Informal Discussion	Normandy House 744 N. Rush Street
th Session :30 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.	Perspectives for Cooperative Research Chairman - Philip Haring Discussion Leader - C. Arnold Anderson Discussant - T. David Williams Discussant - Norton Ginsburg	Normandy House

ADJOURNMENT

ALL CONFERENCE MEMBERS PARTICIPATE IN ALL SESSIONS

IBRARY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

60 NORTH WABASH AVENUE • CHICAGO ILLINOIS 60611 USA • SUPERIOR 7-7928

MIDWEST RESEARCH CONFERENCE
ON
EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND A REAPPRAISAL OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
October 30 - November 1, 1964

Participants

. Arnold Anderson	University of Chicago	Comparative Education Center and Department of Sociology
obert Armstrong	Lake Forest College	Department of Economics
ohn Augelli	University of Kansas	Department of Geography
ack Baranson	Indiana University	International Development and Research Center
eonard Binder	University of Chicago	Department of Political Science
eorge I. Blanksten	Northwestern University	Department of Political Science
arl de Schweinitz, Jr.	Northwestern University	Department of Economics
. A. Fatouros	Indiana University	School of Law
esley R. Fishel+	Michigan State University	Department of Political Science
orton S. Ginsburg	University of Chicago	Department of Geography
hilip Haring	Knox College	Department of Political Science
hilip M. Hauser	University of Chicago	Department of Sociology
ames B. Hendry	Michigan State University	Department of Economics
. Murray Herlihy	Lake Forest College	Department of Economics
obert T. Holt	University of Minnesota	Department of Political Science
ert F. Hoselitz++	University of Chicago	Department of Economics
cott D. Johnston	Hamline University	Department of Political Science
rank H. King	University of Kansas	Department of Economics
ordecai Kreinin	Michigan State University	Department of Economics
. Arthur Lewis	Princeton University	Economics and International Affairs
arvin Miracle	University of Wisconsin	Department of Agricultural Economics
heodore Morgan	University of Wisconsin	Department of Economics
anning Nash	University of Chicago	Department of Anthropology
aymond L. Randall	Indiana University	Department of Government
ugh Schwartz	University of Kansas	Department of Economics
al Serrie	Beloit College	Department of Anthropology
eorge Stolnitz++	Indiana University	Department of Economics
ister Thomasine	Rosary College	Department of Economics
harles P. Warren	University of Illinois, Chicago	Department of Sociology and Anthropology
dward Werner	University of Wisconsin	School of Commerce
ndrew Whiteford	Beloit College	Department of Anthropology
. David Williams	Northwestern University	School of Education and Department of Economics
aniel Wit	Northern Illinois University	Department of Political Science

. S. Office of Education - Peter S. Mousolite, Acting Regional Representative
ibrary of International Relations - Eloise ReQua, Director
ibrary of International Relations - Jane Statham, Associate Director

ivisory Committee
bsent - out of the country
bsent - ill

ANALYSES OF THE DATA AND FINDINGS

Selected Excerpts from Proceedings

Session I

UNEMPLOYMENT IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

By W. Arthur Lewis

Under-developed countries did relatively well in the 1950's, with respect to the growth of output. According to the United Nations[1], real output grew over the decade at an annual rate of 4.1 per cent in Afrida, 4.2 in the Far East, 5.2 in West Asia, and 4.6 in Latin America. All these rates exceed what most experts would have prophesied in 1950. The subject of this paper is the curious phenomenon that unemployment seems to be growing as fast as output. I refer not to disguised unemployment on family farms, but to actual unemployment among people who work for wages. The phenomenon, if true, is curious because, after much discussion of this possibility in the early part of the nineteenth century, economists have grown to believe that unemployment must diminish in an economy growing as rapidly as at 4 per cent per annum. We have special explanations for cyclical unemployment, such as all developed economies experience regularly, and for structural unemployment in depressed industries or areas, such as Great Britain experienced in the 1920's. Both result from declining investment. Unemployment associated with rapidly increasing investment is an unfamiliar animal.

I.

We must begin with problems of measurement. We are dealing only with people who work for wages, and are not therefore concerned with the surplus, if any, on family farms. Unfortunately there are no reliable measures of unemployment in under-developed countries. None has comprehensive social insurance, from which the numbers in receipt of unemployment compensation might be

(1) World Economic Survey, 1963, page 19.

derived. Many have registers, to which the unemployed are invited to add their names. For example, the registered unemployed in India[1] increased from 254,000 in 1948 to 1,754,000 in 1961. However, since in most cases registration brings neither a job nor relief pay, many unemployed do not register, and doubtless some keep their names on the register even after they have found employment; also registration is usually confined to the larger cities.

A Census can provide useful information if it includes questions about employment; and some countries have also made special surveys of unemployment from time to time. However, one of the problems is then to define the labour force. For example 48,000 persons told the Census takers in Jamaica in 1960 that they wanted a job and had never had one[2]. Should they be included in the labour force, of which they would then be 7 per cent? If so, the average rate of unemployment in the Census week was 21 per cent, including persons who worked for part of the week. However, a substantial proportion of those who wanted a job but had never had one were over 30 years old, and must be presumed to be able to get along without finding employment.

Experience in Western Europe in the 1950's has emphasized that the size of the labour force depends on the amount of work offering. Thus in Great Britain the number of people aged 15 to 64 increased only by 400,000 in the 1950's, but the number of working people in that age group increased by 1,400,000. Women seek work where work is available, but not otherwise. Thus in Lancashire, a cotton area, the proportion of women in the labour force is much higher than in South Wales, a mining area. If the number of persons in the labour force is flexible even in a highly developed economy like Britain, it is even more flexible in under-developed countries, which contain enormous reservoirs of people outside the labour market who will enter that market gladly if work becomes available. And if you cannot define the labour force, you cannot say

(1) United Nations, Statistical Year Book 1962, page 58
(2) Census of Jamaica 1960, Vol. II, Part H.

how many persons are unemployed.

Another problem is that, alas, not all the unemployed are employable. Many young people who leave school are unable to find continuous employment. They then commence a disastrous pattern of living. A young man gets one day's work here; gets no work tomorrow; cadges a meal the next day from his aunt; finds another job for a few hours; steals some small thing while the owner is not looking; shares a meal with a friend; borrows a few cents from a patron; and so on. After one has lived this life for two or three years, one becomes unemployable, and could not do eight hours work a day for five days a week even if it were offered - for psychological no less than physical reasons. Thus governments which set up public works programmes to relieve the unemployed are sometimes puzzled by the discrepancy between the numbers known to be unemployed and the number who turn up for work. The unemployables want only a few hours work per week, and cannot do more.

It is unsatisfactory to talk about unemployment without being able to define the unemployed precisely. It is also unsatisfactory to assert that unemployment has increased during the 1950's without being able to document the statement. Nevertheless one must report that this opinion is widely held. Throughout the under-developed world a few already large towns are exploding in size, with the number of people increasing faster than the number of jobs. Unemployment, juvenile delinquency and crime are becoming major concerns in towns where it used to be safe to go out and leave your door open. One knows cities where, in the absence of unemployment pay, burglary has become the largest industry. One cannot offer statistics, but can only report the surprise and despair of seasoned observers who notice that in spite of rapid rates of growth of output, and high rates of capital formation, unemployment nevertheless seems to increase. Jamaica's may be an extreme case. There, as far as we can see, net investment during the fifties averaged 18 per cent of national income,

and real output increased at an annual rate of 6 per cent. Eleven per cent of the labour force emigrated, yet unemployment seems to have been as great in 1960 as in 1950.

Selected Excerpts from Discussion
Session I

CHAIRMAN BLANKSTEN: We do not have any discussants for tonight's session and we will therefore be able to move more directly into the general discussion. Let me suggest for the assistance of our reporter, that you identify yourselves when you speak.

As you know, our plan is to publish the proceedings of this Conference, so let me suggest in view of that that each of us when he participates in the discussion, especially for the first time, begin by giving us his name. I think that will serve two functions. First, it will help us all to become acquainted with each other more rapidly, and second, it will assist us with the public record.

With that reminder, le me now open the discussion to general discussion on Professor Lewis' paper.

I now declare the session open to any questions or any comments stimulated by Professor Lewis' presentation.

MR. BINDER: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BLANKSTEN: Yes.

MR. BINDER: Leonard Binder, University of Chicago.

I am still intrigued by your recommendation -- this time you are recommending, whereas you said ten years ago you were not -- for the holding down of wages in the modern sector, I believe you called it.

In one or two places near the end of the paper you used the word "should", indicating that the increased -- I am probably not going to use the right terminology because I am not an economist -- indicating that the increased

income to these industries was a rent factor and this should go to the owner of the resource which should be the state, or is the state in some cases. I am not sure which the term was.

There are a number of recommendations made, that is, possibly there is the recommendation that the state should be the owner of the resource, which is a more highly questionable recommendation.

What I would like to explore is whether or not your "should" regarding the holding down of wages in the modern sector refers to the explicit value of reducing unemployment in the economy as a whole or whether you are after other values going beyond that, and if you are concerned only with the value of reducing unemployment or limiting unemployment, it appears to me that from the materials you have presented you have demonstrated that unemployment has not fallen, but I am not quire sure that it has increased.

MR. LEWIS: Oh, yes. I think, really, we ought to start at that end to see whether my impression of the places I have been to is supported, namely that open unemployment has been increasing.

Professor Harbison has just come back from Venezuela and he tells me that there they are terribly concerned and extremely puzzled. They have had a 9 per cent per annum rate of growth of the national output for a long time now and unemployment is just mounting by leaps and bounds.

He has been around the world in recent years. Our impressions are both the same, that this is a real phenomenon and not something we are dreaming up, but perhaps we could start at that end.

CHAIRMAN BLANKSTEN: With respect to some of the distinctions that are drawn here, for example, you talked about unemployment in the modern sector and another distinction that would occur to me would be that between skilled and unskilled labor. Would not these distinctions be especially crucially important in this kind of a problem?

MR. LEWIS: This is all unskilled unemployment one is talking about, really.

MR. BINDER: We have another issue, you know. Let us say that we do have --

MR. LEWIS: Let me give you a particular example.

MR. BINDER: All right.

MR. LEWIS: You ask me why one should be so concerned. Let me take a man who is now extremely concerned, and he is the Prime Minister of a state which came into existence yesterday or the day before yesterday, Zambia. Northern Rhodesia has one really profitable industry, the copper mines, and Mr. Kaunda and the copper companies are on very good terms at the moment.

50 per cent of the profits of the copper mines in the form of a corporation tax goes to the government of Northern Rhodesia. The copper mines employ very few people. The mines, as you know, in all of these economies employ very few people but they produce a tremendous amount of wealth.

If you were in the position of Mr. Kaunda and the few people that are employed by the mines at relatively high wages (I do not know what the figure is in Northern Rhodesia but I would wager that it is at least five times what the average person in Northern Rhodesia is able to earn) came up with a demand for a 20 per cent increase in wages, which ten years ago Mr. Kaunda, being a Nationalist, would have been backing solidly, if you were in that position would you now be backing that movement or would you be saying, "If the copper mines are making extra profits these belong to the economy of Northern Rhodesia and we will use this money to build roads, to develop agriculture, to build schools, hospitals and so forth?" What would you do?

MR. BINDER: The question is unfair. You see, if the issue is what ought to be done, then it is unfair to put me in the position of Mr. Kaunda or in the position of a miner. I have to stay in my own position and ask what ought to be done. That is why I wanted to have you refer your recommendations to a particular value.

MR. LEWIS: What do you think ought to be done in your own position?

MR. BINDER: Well, of course, I may feel that I do not even care that the state of Zambia continue in existence, in which case, you see, the framework of values is such that --

MR. LEWIS: I am not running away. I mean, I am asked, "What do you recommend?" I am giving an answer. Please don't run away.

MR. BINDER: An answer to whom?

MR. LEWIS: To you, Mr. Kaunda or anybody else. Don't run away. What would you do? What do you recommend for Northern Rhodesia? Social scientists have a social responsibility. What would you recommend to Mr. Kaunda?

MR. BINDER: I still say that you are setting a framework for your social responsibility which is that of the state of Zambia.

Within the framework of that assumption one might say, then, that in order for the state to persist this might be necessary, to have some source of revenue, but there are an host of other questions.

For example, if unemployment is increasing in the non-modern sector and at the same time by this capital-intensive development you are increasing in national product at the rate of 9 per cent per annum, is it not possible, conceivable, that if you hold wages down in the modern sector you will not increase so fast?

MR. LEWIS: In fact, you might increase faster. The trouble with these economies is that they are increasing the national product at the expense of importing machinery. The thing does not make any sense whatsoever.

Jobs which could be done by people are being done by machines which are imported, so wealth is being created to send away when the same wealth could be created by labor and kept in the economy. It does not make any sense at all.

MR. BINDER: I am not certain that your assertion as to the "same wealth" is correct. Machines are far more efficient.

I remember the Harbison-Ibrahim volume on Egyptian industry and the testi-

mony of the managers of Egyptian industry that the machines are much more efficient than the men. They want the machines, those managers there, and they feel that they can trust the machines more than they can the men.

MR. LEWIS: Of course, the profit is greater and this is why they put them in. Let me give you a concrete example. A major political issue in Jamaica today, and has been for the last five years, is the loading of bananas on the ships. Bananas are loaded on ships by hand in Jamaica and they are taken to Bristol where they are unloaded by machinery at half the price it takes to load them.

Wages have gone up and up and up in the banana loading industry because they are chasing the bauxite wages and now it has reached the point where the banana industry of Jamaica is being squeezed. It is not itself a very efficient industry and it cannot afford to pay these high wages for loading bananas and the farmers are threatening to load the bananas themselves rather than go on paying these wages and have demanded the right to import machinery.

The machinery will do it much more cheaply than the people, but all that would happen is that income which could be used to support some people in Jamaica will instead be used to support the makers of machinery in Birmingham. Now, what sense does that make to the people in Jamaica?

CHAIRMAN BLANKSTEN: Manning Nash.

MR. NASH: I cannot quarrel with your analysis of the modern sector, but when you take the other part of your dual society, I think you err badly, and let me tell you why.

They have not been, since colonial impact, at least in Asia and Africa, in any state empirically of equilibrium. They have been accommodating to their surplus population by in fact decreasing the per capita income of everybody in it. They do have accommodation mechanisms.

MR. LEWIS: Asia has surplus population, not Africa.

MR. NASH: Asia, all right. Overpopulation there is a problem and what it

continues to do empirically, anyway, is to subdivide tasks so that the net output is not larger but the individual shares are produced, so the modern sector is a pull in one sense, not only because of its wages, but also this is the declining level of living year after year after year in places like India and Indonesia, so I think you have to build in the notion that these are "pathological" dual societies, if we can use that word in quotes, and not in any sense of equilibrium.

There have been for a long time great pressures in the countryside to break out and anything will pull them out.

MR. LEWIS: Yes. I am not disagreeing with this. All I am saying is that so long as they are on the family farm, they have some income.

MR. NASH: Yes.

MR. LEWIS: Now, you do something which brings them into the town. I am not worried only about the people from the farms. There is also the surplus in urban employments that gets thrown out because of higher wages; but even if you take the people on the farms and you pull them into the townw where they have no income, this is a social problem.

MR. NASH: I am making the point that they are social problems back home anyway.

MR. LEWIS: They are not anything like the same social problem back on the farm that they are in the town.

MR. NASH: Well, that depends on the country and its political organization.

MR. LEWIS: Let us put it this way, that when they are on the farms they are a hidden social problem, and when they are on your doorstep burgling your house at night in the towns, they are an open social problem.

MR. NASH: They are in many ways a more serious social problem. In Burma, for example, or in Indonesia or Viet Nam, one of the sources of the recruitment of insurgents is this rural population which takes off for dacoiting under political banners and keeps the government in a state of turmoil all the time,

so they are real social rural problems. You do not have to bring them into the cities.

MR. LEWIS: I would not accept Burma in your list of countries that are overpopulated. I would agree if you have in mind India and Pakistan, but not Burma.

MR. NASH: They have this same kind of rural trouble. One of the sources is that boys can leave the family farm without lowering the income and take five years off as a dacoit or as a PV Volunteer or as a Red rebel and keep the country in a terrible state of turmoil.

If you ask yourself, where are the sources of the peasant revolts in countries that are relatively prosperous, like Burma, it is this "pathological" development in the countryside.

Selected Excerpts from Proceedings

Session IV

Economic Growth in Newly Settled Areas As Contrasted with Old Settled Areas

presented by Theodore Morgan

MR. MORGAN: I think the first thing I should do, and briefly, is to try to put sense into the title, "Newly Settled Areas as Contrasted with Old Settled Areas."

The problem is that of the effect of European exodus during the last several centuries into other parts of the world. Europeans went, in part, into areas that were already densely settled. These are called old-settled areas. They went to India and to other parts of Asia, and to some relatively densely settled parts of South America. They also went to areas that were either initially or eventually, through disease or fighting, thinly settled: among these Australia, New Zealand, North America and perhaps a few other areas.

Obviously, there has been a tremendous difference in the experience of economic growth in these two areas. I suppose the extreme contrast is India and the United States.

At this point you may feel it is all too easy how to explain the contrast.

I. First of all, I should like to say a few words about the context into which the reasoning falls. One tries to explain economic growth; we from different disciplines have different kinds of emphasis.

What sort of causes do we talk of? -- Human resources, natural resources, produced capital, technology, the value system, social organization, political factors, and no doubt others still.

I think we would agree that broadly considered, all of these have relevance. They are all influential. The question is not, therefore, a matter of "either or". It is more subtle. It is a matter of the relative importance of

each of these and perhaps of their interrelationships both in timing and in causation.

There is involved also the extent to which these are necessary or only conditioning, only supplementary, causes of growth. There is the extent, Gerschenkron will emphasize, to which you can get around blocks to growth, that you may have a society growing despite what a priori you might have argued to be effective blocks.

This is the pattern. What I say is not to throw out X or Y causes. It is simply to argue for a particular supplementary cause as being -- on prima facie evidence and not final evidence -- an important cause.

II. I do not want to spend very much time on the two man usual explanations of diverse standards of living in, let us say, Australia, New Zealand, Canada and the United States and perhaps Hawaii, South Africa, Uruguay and Argentina; as compared to India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Indonesia, Burma, Malaya, the Andean countries, the Near East and most of Africa.

A Ricardian economist would think of the ratio of labor, and in the longer run, also of capital, to natural resources. And so Marshall suggests in his chapter on Economic Progress that the "field of employment" any place offers to capital and labor depends first of all on its natural resources. But he does not consider the resources-proportion explanation as the central one. Instead, he picks out trade as the chief cause of the modern prosperity of new countries.

He speaks flatly and uncharacteristically. He says:

"The causes that determine the economic progress of nations belong to the study of international trade ..."

(I suspect that to all of us who are not economists, that sounds very limited indeed, and probably that reaction is right.)

Within the heading of trade Marshall emphasizes the flow of capital -- which exchanges goods and services moving into an area against the promise of

an outflow later of local products.

Nurske talks of the 19th century as a period in which international investments scored its greatest triumphs with strong emphasis on the great importance of international investment for the growth of what I call here the newly settled areas.

Now, Millikan, Rostow, Rosenstein-Rodan, Leibenstein, Nelson, and the studies that Chenery -- well, Chenery's office, really, the laborious and impressive studies that his office is making for AID -- place emphasis upon import coefficients and export projections for predicting foreign aid needs and their possible and hoped-for tapering off as time goes on.

(I had until today put Professor Lewis among the group of people who would emphasize as central the saving and investment problems of growth. Professor Lewis sent me a little note this morning saying that he gave only one chapter of this out of seven or eight and that he did not feel he should be placed there. I tendered my apology and promised to correct my error.)

The savings-investment emphasis is presented in Nurske's Wicksell lectures, and in an excellent study by Douglas North (Economic Growth in the United States). It is developed in Haberler's Cairo lectures as a cause for growth in a dynamic context. Contrary to Myrdal and Prebisch, Haberler finds a number of ways in which trade stimulates over time the growth of nations. Perhaps I should list them: it provides them with capital goods, machinery and materials, it facilitates the flow to them of financial capital, disseminates knowledge, serves as the means for importing skills and talents and checks monopoly.

This is an impressive list. Meier follows much the same position in his attractive book, International Trade and Development.

III. Now, I come to a section of my paper that I should like to jump over. My critics may take me to task for it; if so, we can spend time on it.

The theory of investment-in-physical capital as central cause of growth has been subject to criticism by Schultz and his fellow investigators, also by

Abramovitz and others at the National Bureau of Economic Research and by Solow and Denison in econometric and statistical studies which suggest that physical capital explains from one-eighth to one-quarter of growth and that the "residual" or non-measurable inputs account for from one-half to seven-eighths.

I have put on the black-board some other data that have fascinated me. They compare for the first half-century before World War I the value of investment capital and of human capital outflows from Europe overseas. The data will probably be less impressive to every one else than to me. I have spent so much time on them that I have, perhaps, a myopic view. I think they are worth considering seriously.

You can get -- this is a judgment -- pretty good data, data good enough to give you orders of magnitude, on the value of the flow of immigrants as compared to the value of investment flows.

On the left here you see the value of U.K. to U.S. capital and human flows. On the right you see Europe to All-Overseas. There is a good deal of estimating, and it is labored approximating. The results are no more than rough.

To illustrate: what is the economic value of an immigrant? First, estimate the working life span of individuals once they arrive in this country. This is taken from life expectancy tables for the period in conjunction with data on the age at which people came to this country. Find average earnings in this country and discount them back to the time when they got off the ship at Ellis Island. The data we have from both British and American sources, is that some 102,000 people per year were coming over on the average from the U.K. They are valued, in addition to their discounted product here, at the cost of bringing them up in England. (I can talk about that but I will not unless you press me.)

Then you can do the same thing for the value of investment flows. Their current amount comes from Imlah data. Their contribution to product relies on

marginal-capital-output-ratio estimates taken mainly from Kuznets' studies. The range is wide; undoubtedly the actuality might well be wider than that.

Over on the right (of the black-board) are the same kinds of data exactly, although the range of doubt is a little greater for All-Europe and All-Overseas.

What is the outcome of the comparison? I think one should conclude that the orders of magnitude are in general roughly the same.

But for the U.K.-U.S. the orders of magnitude favor the immigrants -- they were economically more important. You might well say that if the figures are worth taking seriously at all, the greater importance of immigrants to the United States was probably not a matter of chance. The relative importance of immigrants probably is genuinely a part of the reason for the unique economic growth of this country.

These figures, by the way, do not give a complete comparison. They take no account at all of back-flows to Europe and the U.K. from immigrant remittances on the one hand and amortization and interest on the other. These are not included because I could not find data for them. To that extent these figures are imperfect.

If it is true that the immigrant flows have a value equal to or greater than that of investment flows in the half-century before World War I, then I submit there is no doubt at all about the relative economic magnitudes of these two flows a half-century further back, or a century further back. Investment outflows from England and from Europe were hardly beginning before the early part of the 19th century, but people were coming to this country and elsewhere voluntarily or involuntarily, a long time before.

Selected Excerpts from Discussion

Session IV

Chairman, Mr. Hendry

MR. ANDERSON: There is a certain appropriateness in a Wisconsin professor picking up Turner's frontier theory and extending it. As my memory brings back to me the comments and criticisms of Turner, I think I would find the new version also shaky.

For instance, if one were to compare, say, 16th century Europe and 19th century Europe, or Europe and the overseas countries, I think you could ask: Is there in modern Europe or in overseas areas actually more mobility between social classes? Is there more instability of fortunes? I am doubtful.

I am inclined to think that the absence of development is not due to the presence or absence of general characteristics of the society, and particularly for the countries copying Europe, but to the presence of specific cultural traits with certain clusters. The whole line of reasoning of the frontier theory and related broad, sweeping conceptions of social structure, even as a sociologist, I take a dim view of. I think you had better stick to your international trade theory.

MR. HENDRY: Mr. Nash.

MR. NASH: I think for what you call settled societies, I take those to be societies with pretty dense land-man ratios and some complicated social structure into which foreigners come, I think what that does not lead to development has been pretty well explained. There is Johnathan Levin's book, The Export Economy, into which he treats Burma and Peru and the development of a foreign factor economy which leads to about thirty years of expansion but such a distorting of the factor proportions in the economy that when the guano runs out or when other countries get into the rice business, you are dead; you have no flexibility to shift over and no skills to do anything else.

That is a case, I think, of the settled societies where the foreign influence leads to about thirty years of development and then stagnation, so I think we have a pretty clear picture of how a foreign factor economy works and eventually leads to a blockage of development.

What bothers me again is that pioneers do not necessarily build social structures which are useful. I think I remember a little more about the Turner hypothesis, maybe because I went to school later, but it was not the pioneers, the people out west, who made America great; it was the people staying back home in the dirty old slums with the old customs, with the European ethnic groups. These were the offshoots, the nogoodnicks, that were going out there and boozing it up out west, so that the land-man space there, the pioneer ethic, was not conducive to economic growth in America and what really made it grow were the settled traditional glass-blowers from Antwerp and all these kinds of people who had all of the rigidities and turned out to be the people who gave America most of its things. I think Oscar Hamdlin documents that very well.

Now, one last word. Since we seem to be seeking sort of a magic key either in migrants, or given capital or trade, I will put up a candidate I have. I think economic development takes place when there is some investment which is a technological break-through. Now, nobody knows what a technological break-through is until you have made it, and the search for that and the investment in that gets you over some critical hump which has a whole lot of -- I wish I could use the language better -- link effects, et cetera --

MR. BARANSON: Multipliers.

MR. NASH: I beg your pardon?

MR. BARANSON: Multipliers.

MR. NASH (continuing): -- multipliers and linkages which change the character of the economy. I think if you will look at Mexico, they found two or three high payoff technological break-throughs, and invested in them and it

has been going like crazy.

Now, the problem or the dilemma of Mexican economic development is that they have to find the next one.

Economic development is having your society geared in such a manner that there are people always searching for and anticipating a technological break-through and having the investment to make it. In the 20th century it is not hard to get the money. The problem is to find the technological break-throughs. That is my candidate for the most influential factor of development.

MR. HENDRY: Mr. Holt.

MR. HOLT: Professor Morgan, I was very much taken by your treatment here of social mobility and social status as an element that might be involved. I have done some research on pre-modern Britain, France, China and Japan, which I think is probably very relevant to the comments you were making.

One of the interesting factors that links England and Japan as similar cases and contrasts them with France and China deals with this factor of social mobility, but it is a little bit different than the one you are suggesting.

MR. HENRY: Mr. King.

MR. KING: I wonder if I can just touch on this question of social mobility, particularly with regard to the contrast in China and England.

You made the point, as I understood it, that there was considerable social mobility in China, that in Manchu or 19th century China there was insignificant economic growth, and you tried to connect these factors.

Yet it was a particular kind of social mobility that existed in China. It was a kind in which a peasant, through education, through hard study, might very well become a leading official. His power remained, however, completely subject to the whims of an authoritarian state. The social mobility that occurred in England occurred in a free society and is hardly comparable. Historians have concluded that there was less social mobility in England (based on Cambridge University graduates, for example); yet when the few lower

class university graduates entered society they moved into a position of independent authority and independent action.

To turn to China gain, those who bought degrees, who changed to the gentry status, did not necessarily take official positions and many of them were numbered among the few entrepreneurs that China had. Am I misunderstanding your point?

MR. HOLT: I think you are a little bit, if I may interrupt you just briefly. First, I was talking very specifically about mobility into the aristocracy. I was not talking about mobility in any other place in society.

Secondly, I did not address myself to the phenomenon of downward mobility out of the aristocracy, which I think is an additional part of the argument here.

MR. KING: Let me comment on the foreign factor economy. It does not seem to me that it is today completely at variance with the idea of or need for technological change. The difference between the nineteenth century and today lies in the fact that the local population of a foreign factor economy were long unconscious of the potential for change. When they did become conscious, the foreign factor economy could be used to further development goals -- this is the difference. People are now conscious of the potential for change and therefore they can use these export booms if they are wise; they can use the resources they gather during these brief periods in order to implement a beginning development plan and to achieve that first technological change.

You stated there was imperfection in trade as a weapon in the development process. But in the 19th century these export economies were more passive. When there was a boom, this was regarded as a fortuitous circumstance and there was no reason why the rest of the economy, why the state of thinking in the economy or why the level of education would be at a point where developmental advantage could be taken of the export boom. This presumably is where the study of economic development effected a change.

Today we are supposed to be able to take advantage of these aspects of trade. Perhaps in fact we do not always do so, but when we say that in fifteen years we should have expected some development, that we cannot find a developed economy -- or we can find very few -- I wonder whether this is really very much time. When you come to think of some of the first development plans, some of the first conscious taking advantage of export earnings for investment and development purposes, I would only go back about ten years in many colonies, especially in Africa. Even, for example, in Malaya the first development plan began in 1955-1956, whereas before that it was merely a continuation of a government capital-expenditure program. Perhaps we may be a little overly pessimistic in this condemnation of the failure to take advantage of the trade benefits.

Selected Excerpts from Proceedings

Session VI

Chairman, Mr. Haring

Perspectives for Cooperative Research

presented by C. Arnold Anderson

MR. HARING: One word on why this conference has been a success, which I do not have to belabor at all. I have heard it informally, outside the Conference, all through the week-end. It is that unlike many conferences, this one did not consist of the production of a series of scholarly papers all typed and neat about which the author knew everything and nobody else much. This has been, as we have said, a brainstorming session, we have agreed, and this is the secret of the whole thing and a great credit to the committee that set it up in this fashion. Everybody has unanimously said, "I've learned an awful lot."

Now, I want to introduce the speakers very quickly, but adequately. We have first Mr. C. Arnold Anderson, who was an educational specialist with the World Bank and particularly concerned with Kenya. He has taught in Sweden. He is now Director of the Comparative Education Center at the University of Chicago and a member of the Sociology Department.

Mr. Anderson will be followed by Mr. Williams, the reason for this being that Mr. Williams has the next largest amount of material to get to us quickly. Mr. Williams was educated in England and Canada and the United States, at M.I.T. here. He has done work in Ghana and at Harvard and is now Professor of Economics and Education at Northwestern.

Finally, we have Mr. Ginsburg, who has a very critical mind, and we put him last in order to cut the other two apart, whom everybody here knows. He is a professor of Geography and Associate Dean of the college at the University of Chicago and did his work here at Chicago. He has also been considerably active in Southeast Asia, Malaysia and Indonesia, as you know.

I will now turn it over to Mr. Anderson.

MR. ANDERSON: If you will look at your program you will discover that this Conference was supposed to have talked some about education. It hasn't. I shall now proceed to do so in the form of a series of dicta which are, so to speak, the topic sentences for paragraphs if I had written a paper, which I did not.

Let me first indicate that I think we might consider schools, or formal education, as having principally five functions. One is, of course, to indoctrinate children and give them loyalties and objects of identification and self-conceptions. The second is to prepare them to share respectively in the universals, specialties, and alternatives of their culture.

Third, schools perpetuate and elaborate intellectual systems and particularly the educational system itself. Schools select and mold elites.

Finally, and least important, schools prepare individuals for vocations, but even more important, get individuals ready to be trained for vocations.

I would like to make next a few comments on how education plays its part in development. I think it is a remarkable and often unnoticed fact that formal education of the kind with which we have been familiar for many generations in the West is remarkably easy to transfer to other societies and to get operating as a going system. Always, of course, there will be some new results and a lack of some old ones, but the broader sorts of influences that one might call education rather than schooling, which are important for development, economic or political, are not so easy to transfer. Therein lie many of the problems we have been talking about.

Now, there is actually a very uncertain and ambiguous correlation of formal education with economic development. Most of the literature setting forth correlation coefficients and so on is a tissue of exaggerations and half-truths. One difficulty is that we fail to distinguish the long from the short-run effects, for they are quite different.

Clearly, you cannot have technological development without skills in the population to operate that technology, and this requires training. It does not follow, however, that a proliferation and extension of schooling of any kind will produce development. There is also the very uncertain problem of lead and lag between economic development and formal education and such evidence as we have indicates that in the short run it is economic development which leads and formal education which lags. This is the real proof contained in the new Harbison-Myers book, contrary to the authors' own assertions.

I think it is also very important to keep in mind, though we know very little about this in detail, that the usefulness of school to a society, and the usefulness of the graduates of schools, depend upon how these individuals are taken hold of by other agencies or institutions in the society and how these other agencies motivate the products of schools to use what they presumably learned in the schools.

Looking at our own history, I think that we frequently do not realize that in our past the ways of life of the populace were the stuff of economic activity and economic change. *Changes in those activities* that we now call economic development did not require the populace to rapidly acquire a whole new civilization, which is more or less the burden that is being put on the peoples of many countries around the world today.

It is risky to extrapolate Western experience for, among other reasons, the following: Today education is more demanded because it has become a political object regarded as good in itself. Second, the technology being developed today, being borrowed around the world, is much more complex than that of the past. Third, there is the fact that countries today want rapid economic development, a conception that was relatively foreign to our ancestors. Fourth, that these countries in many instances must develop both their polity and their economy simultaneously, a task that very few western societies faced.

I think, then, that we have to conclude that the payoff in economic terms

from a given amount of formal education will be less in today's developing countries than it was in our countries. Nevertheless, and this is not really a paradox, the incremental effect or the distinctive effect of education could be greater in the new countries than it was in our society.

I am always impressed, as I go back and re-read it, with Walinsky's remarks; he points out repeatedly essentially the following: there was no important economic project in Burma which was held up, frustrated, or seriously compromised for the lack of trained manpower.

I think this is a statement that we are going to find being made more and more about developing countries -- which essentially is to elaborate a point that Manning Nash made at the end of his paper this morning.

Now, some comments on the problem of balancing economic and other criteria of education. Obviously, nobody in his right mind would say that the main purpose or sole purpose of education is to produce economic development. We happen to be living in a period when people are obsessed with the manpower view of education. The payoff in conferences and discussions and consultant-*ships and so on for one specializing* in education is to relate it to economic development, but this is clearly a partial and provincial view.

One of the things I think we too often fail to ask ourselves in looking at the manpower studies is, what are the so-called needs for manpower that these studies set forth? You can read planning documents by the score, with elaborate tables often down to the individual unit, of the number of different kinds of trained manpower needed. It is almost impossible, however, to find out the criteria of need that is used.

Simultaneously, you have the fact that these countries face staggering unemployment, as Arthur Lewis was pointing out, and yet curiously, both things are set forth by international agencies this way: "This country has great unemployment of educated people, this country needs an enormous increase in the number of educated people." That is ridiculous.

Now, there is always, in trying to assess the role of education in development, the investment problem, and investment choices are marginal. It makes no sense to say that this country would be much better off if it would spend X-billion, or X-million pounds or francs, or whatever on schools. It has to make choices at the margins between schools and other agencies, and the problem of conserving resources that are truly scarce is a formidable one.

Most of the people who are writing the pronouncements on manpower and education fail to face the problem of what might be accomplished in development by shifting money away from education. Parenthetically, I would be very happy if every developing country would take 10 per cent annually from now on of its education budget and use it as a subsidy for the advertising industry, as a prod to development. That is a dictum.

Selected Excerpts from Discussion

Session VI

MR. MORGAN: I should like to ask Professor Anderson a question, in pursuit of my hope that he would prove some of his statements. What is your evidence that the political indoctrination of Russian youngsters has not been successful?

MR. ANDERSON: There I fall back on my colleagues who have been doing research extensively on and in Russia. There is a forthcoming paper in the volume on education and political development shortly to be printed by Princeton (edited by Jim Coleman) by Azrael of the Chicago staff. He has a very long and detailed analysis of materials which he collected in Russia, in which I think he has demonstrated what we suspect from other kinds of evidence, that the specific indoctrination above and beyond the kind of thing that comes from A, living in a closed society, and B, absorbing the general climate of opinion around you, but the more specific and tangible and copper riveted indoctrination seems not to have been successful in the Soviet Union. The evidence for this

is mounting.

MR. MORGAN: You are blocking out the simple fact of ignorance. In other words, if I live in a world in which I hear nothing within a certain range --

MR. ANDERSON: Yes. I am blocking that out. I used the word "indoctrination", not "control". Obviously, you can control access to information and this will affect people's attitudes, but I mean specific indoctrination seems not to have had much take.

MR. MORGAN: You are not throwing the baby out with the bath? In other words, keep me ignorant of three-quarters of the facts, and of course, I won't --

MR. ANDERSON: Well, if you keep people ignorant, then you have a random factor, so to speak, and it is perfectly clear that there have been random elements. You also have, in so far as the communications blockade breaks down, as it began to do first in the war, as the armies met each other, and second, in the post-war period, then you began to get spirals of change going on which spread. There clearly seems to have been more change in the areas accessible to contact.

Now, there are other factors. For instance, in the Georgian universities, the students seem to be more recalcitrant, but they always have been. Leningrad students seem to be more recalcitrant, but Leningrad people in general pride themselves on being international. Some of this attitude or self-conception seems to have persisted right through the whole period since the revolution. So you get all sorts of cross purposes, plus the simple fact that as pressures begin to let up a little since the death of Stalin, you had such simple things as the museums beginning to let people see the fabulous collections of 19th century French paintings. When these began to become available, this was one of the things that undermined the Soviet conception of what good painting was. Once you lift the lid, then there are all sorts of spontaneous processes as well, but sheer indoctrination seems to have been of limited effect.

CONCLUSIONS AND RESULTS:
COMMENTS OF PARTICIPANTS AFTER THE CONFERENCE

The following comments of participants are typical of letters received after the Conference. They indicate that the objectives of the sessions were achieved, particularly, 1) giving new perspectives for research through interdisciplinary discussion of investigations in progress, 2) bringing promising young faculty members and others less experienced in underdeveloped areas into contact with outstanding scholars of the subject, and 3) the procedural form of the Conference drew particular appreciation in its stimulation of a seldom-accomplished and genuine intellectual exchange which was sustained at a high level throughout the entire Conference. One such expression of appreciation took the form of an invitation to hold the next biennial conference at the writer's university.

CONCLUSIONS AND RESULTS:
COMMENTS OF PARTICIPANTS AFTER THE CONFERENCE

I.

Gave new perspectives for research through inter-disciplinary discussions:

Jack Baranson	**Indiana University**
Mordechai E. Kreinin	**Michigan State University**
Hugh H. Schwartz	**The University of Kansas**
Hal Serrie	**Beloit College**

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH CENTER
INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT CENTER INDIANA UNIVERSITY / 703 EAST 7TH ST. / BLOOMINGTON, INDIANA 47403
AREA CODE: 812
TEL. NO. 3377138

November 4, 1964

Miss Eloise ReQua
Library of International Relations
660 North Wabash Avenue
Chicago 11, Illinois

Dear Miss ReQua:

Just a brief note to commend you and your colleagues on the fine job you did in organizing the Midwest Research Conference reappraising the role of education in economic development. I found the inter-disciplinary encounter especially stimulating and informative.

Such meetings are particularly helpful in formulating our own research programs -- both in terms of suggesting new vistas of problems and providing new research approaches. They extend in depth our awareness of how the various disciplines relate to the problem at hand -- an especially important aspect in looking for solutions. Quite often, one discipline raises questions that are best answered by another. Thus, economists concerned with the entrepreneurial factor in industrial development might best turn to social psychologists for policy implications; and educational goals and techniques need to be tempered with the economic reality of scarce resources and social reality of just how much environmental change can be induced by the school system.

I want to thank you for the opportunity to attend and for three days well spent. Incidentally, I would appreciate two additional copies of your bibliography on international development.

Sincerely,

Jack Baranson

Jack Baranson
Research Associate

JB:kb

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY EAST LANSING

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS - MARSHALL HALL

November 23, 1964

Miss Eloise ReQua, Director
Library of International Relations
660 North Wabash Avenue
Chicago, Illinois

Dear Miss ReQua:

I am writing to express my thanks and appreciation for the conference on Economic Development you organized last month. It was indeed a profitable educational experience. Such interdisciplinary gatherings are extremely valuable in bringing the knowledge of the various social sciences to bear on the problems of economic development.

Sincerely yours,

Max Kreinin

Mordechai Kreinin
Professor of Economics

MK:rm

THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS
LAWRENCE, KANSAS

November 11, 1964

Miss Eloise Re Qua
Director, Library of International Relations
660 North Wabash Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60611

Dear Miss Re Qua:

I would like to express my very great appreciation for having been invited to participate in the conference on economic development which the Library of International Relations sponsored. It was a stimulating and a most enjoyable experience. I found it particularly helpful to hear the observations of the other social sciences on the efforts of economists in incorporating aspects of those other disciplines into their analyses of economic development, and to hear the reaction of the other disciplines to the allegation of several of the economists that some of the other social sciences do not provide a meaningful framework to assist in the analysis of problems of economic development.

I certainly hope that the Library is able to continue such programs.

I appreciate the very fine accommodations which you provided; and though all of the meals were excellent, I shall never forget that truly memorable dinner at The Arts Club. My transportation expenses amounted to $36.83, $35.73 for the round trip by Santa Fe, and $1.10 for a cab fare.

Again, thanking you for all of your many kindnesses, I am,

Sincerely,

Hugh H. Schwartz

Hugh H. Schwartz
Assistant Professor

HHS:ll

BELOIT COLLEGE

BELOIT, WISCONSIN
535-12

Logan Museum
Department of Anthropology
December 10, 1964

Miss Eloise ReQua, Director
Library of International Relations
660 North Wabash Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60611

Dear Miss ReQua:

I would like to strongly thank you for inviting me to the Third Biennial Conference on Research Problems in Underdeveloped Areas. It was a very stimulating series of meetings indeed. The interdisciplinary character of the program was vital and absorbing, and I for one found much food for thought--some of which became manifest in the course in Culture Change that I am currently teaching. Just meeting all kinds of people in disciplines other than my own, and talking off the cuff with them, was very stimulating and useful.

I would also like to compliment you on your library, and on the work you are doing in general. Incidentally, with regards to the book by Kuznets, Moore and Spengler that I was interested in borrowing (Economic Growth), our own library has finally managed to buy a copy, so that it will not be necessary to arrange an inter-library loan. Thanks again for your helpfulness and concern.

Sincerely yours,

Hal Barrie

CONCLUSIONS AND RESULTS:
COMMENTS OF PARTICIPANTS AFTER THE CONFERENCE

II.

Brought promising young faculty members and others less experienced in underdeveloped areas into contact with outstanding scholars of the subject:

James B. Hendry	**Michigan State University**
H. Murray Herlihy	**Lake Forest College**
Marvin P. Miracle	**The University of Wisconsin**
Theodore Morgan	**The University of Wisconsin**

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY EAST LANSING
48823

OFFICE OF THE DEAN OF INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS
Economic and Agricultural Development Institute

November 3, 1964

Miss Eloise ReQua
Director, Library of International Relations
660 North Wabash Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60611

Dear Miss ReQua:

This is just a short note to express my appreciation for the opportunity to attend the Conference on Underdeveloped Areas which the Library of International Relations sponsored over the past weekend. The group you assembled covered a broad and important range of the social sciences and the exchange of viewpoints between the participants was both refreshing and, to me, very illuminating. I have come away with several new ideas to toy with, and I suspect that the others have had the same experience.

It should not be necessary to add that the arrangements which were provided for us were most pleasant, and I think contributed substantially to the tone and atmosphere of friendly give and take which prevailed. Please convey my sentiments to Sister Thomasine and the others working together to arrange the conference -- it was an extremely satisfying set of meetings and I am every grateful to have been able to take part.

With all good wishes.

Sincerely yours,

James B. Hendry

James B. Hendry
Director

JBH:mc

LAKE FOREST COLLEGE LAKE FOREST, ILLINOIS

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS

February 6, 1965

Miss Eloise ReQua, Director
Library of International Relations
660 North Wabash Avenue
Chicago, Illinois, 60611

Dear Miss ReQua:

Thank you for sending me the page proofs from the fifth session of the fall conference, for comments before publication.

I have just two suggested changes. On page 47 I started out with a long, involved sentence which looks horrible in print. I have broken it up into three sentences, which I think makes it read a little clearer. Secondly, on page 48 I have changed the word "but" to "by".

Let me tell you again how stimulating the conference was, particularly for someone like myself with no great "expertise" in development economics, and how important a function the Library, Rosary College and the U.S. Office of Education performed in sponsoring the conference. You in particular are to be highly complimented for the excellent arrangements made in connection with the conference.

Commuting to Lake Forest from Chicago has been rather grim in the last two weeks, but yesterday's break in the weather should improve things considerably. Miss Biggs has conferred with me over Lake Forest's statement in connection with our affiliation with your library, and you should be receiving that document very shortly.

Sincerely yours,

H. Murray Gerlily
Chairman

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE

Madison, Wisconsin 53706

November 2, 1964

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

Telephone: 262-3631

Miss Eloise ReQua, Director
Library of International Relations
660 North Wabash Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60611

Dear Miss ReQua:

Just a note to again express my appreciation for being included in the Conference on Educational Research and a Re-appraisal of Economic Development held last week-end. It was, I think, a highly successful conference and one that was, for me, particularly stimulating and useful.

In addition to specific points made by various conferees and helpful discussions I had with various of the conferees outside of the formal sessions, I found the discussions of the interrelations between the various participants of the social sciences in working on problems of underdeveloped countries of considerable interest. Specifically, discussions of the role and problems of education were highly relevant for some of my own work concerning ways in which agricultural extension can be used to help transform traditional agriculture.

Again, many thanks for making the conference so pleasant.

Sincerely yours,

Marvin P. Miracle
Assistant Professor

MPM/pm

Enc.

The University of Wisconsin

MADISON 53706

RESEARCH PROGRAM ON ECONOMIC
INTERDEPENDENCE IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS
SOCIAL SCIENCE BUILDING

Rec'd 11-3-64

November 2, 1964

Mrs Eloise Requa
Director, Library of International Relations
660 North Wabash Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60611

Dear Mrs Requa:

Thank you most sincerely for a well planned and useful conference. Please also thank for me Sister Thomasina and Mrs Statham for their share in it. I came away, as I think most of us did, with a number of new ideas out of the viewpoints and experience of the other participants. And my own paper benefitted from being exposed as a target.

I'm not sure that I mentioned to you that at the Council of Economic Advisers, to which I am a consultant this fall, I was asked to write up notes on what went on at our meetings, for circulation among the group. I'll get that done this weekend.

With warm regards,

Theodore Morgan
Director of Research

CONCLUSIONS AND RESULTS: COMMENTS OF PARTICIPANTS AFTER THE CONFERENCE

III.

Procedural form of the Conference stimulated genuine intellectual exchange:

A. A. Fatouros Indiana University

Philip S. Haring Knox College

Frank H. H. King The University of Kansas

Invitation to hold next biennial conference at participant's university:

Raymond L. Randall Indiana University

INDIANA UNIVERSITY
School of Law
BLOOMINGTON, INDIANA, 47401

LAW BUILDING

AREA CODE 812
TEL. NO.

November 6, 1964

Miss Eloise ReQua, Director
Library of International Relations
660 North Wabash Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60611

Dear Miss ReQua:

This was a fascinating conference. As I told you at its close, I found it most remarkable that, as time went on, the participants got better attuned to one another and effective communication among them increased. This is what conferences aim at, but so few of them do achieve it. As a result, I find that my understanding of development problems and of the approaches to them of the several disciplines represented has much gained.

Please accept, therefore, along with my thanks for inviting me, my congratulations for arranging everything (and this includes your superlative choice of restaurants) so well.

I am enclosing my statement of travel expenses. I should like to point out that, though I have included all actual expenses, I do not think that you are obligated to cover them all; I am referring in particular to the cab expenses between Bloomington and Indianapolis. My choice of route was prompted by considerations of convenience but I do not know whether the related expenses could be classified, on an expense account basis, as absolutely necessary. I am leaving it to you to judge.

Again, many thanks for a most interesting and instructive weekend.

Sincerely yours,

A. A. Fatouros

AAF:say

Enclosure

PHILIP S. HARING
30 HILLCREST DRIVE
GALESBURG, ILL.

Nov. 3, 1964

Miss Eloise ReQua
Library of International Relations
660 North Wabash Ave.
Chicago, Ill.

Dear Eloise,

The conference on educational research and economic development was a vast success. It was a true brainstorming session, and much of the credit goes to the genius who arranged that the topics be broad and open for discussion so that new ideas could be tried out without anyone saying that a speaker was straying from the subject. Everything in this world is interrelated and it's those relationships between bodies of data that have been established, which currently are causing all our troubles. The conference did a great job of eliciting specific facts in small, efficient doses and then concentrating on their relationship to what else we knew (or thought we did).

The conference kept referring to the need for "social models" or in other words, theories of social organization. May I suggest that a future conference on just this topic would be most welcome, perhaps with Peter M. Blau as leader.

Maybe you will want to get in touch with Dr. Blair Stewart, President of the Associated Colleges of the Midwest (room 1458, 20 north Wacker Dr.) regarding a ten fold membership for the ten colleges whom he represents. Those colleges are Knox and Monmouth in Illinois, Beloit, Ripon, and Lawrence in Wisconsin, Carleton and St. Olaf in Minnesota, Coe, Cornell, and Grinnell in Iowa. All draw heavily on the Chicago area for students who, of course, do research during vacations while at home. (If they don't, they can't long survive.)

If there's still money in the till, my train was $9. But your real contribution was the excitement of hard discussion made possible by the environment, the members from many disciplines, and your graciousness. We're all very grateful. Most valuable weekend I've spent. Thanks again.

Yours,

Phil

Philip S. Haring
assoc. prof., pol. sci.
Knox College

THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS
CENTER FOR EAST ASIAN STUDIES
LAWRENCE, KANSAS

November 3, 1964

Mrs. ReQua, Director
Library of International Relations
660 North Wabash
Chicago, Illinois

Dear Mrs. ReQua:

May I take this opportunity to express my appreciation to you and the Library as well as to the other sponsors of the Conference for the stimulating opportunity. The key to the success of the Conference surely lies in the concept of universal participation based on prepared papers or presentations which are not so esoteric as to bar participation or comment by the Conference membership. While I doubt that the transcript will reveal us as clever as we hoped, I, nevertheless, predict that some contribution will be found to have been made.

My expenses were as follows:

Round-trip, Lawrence to Chicago (First class to Chicago, coach return)	$25.33
Roomette, Lawrence to Chicago	9.40
Taxis	2.00
Breakfast, Sunday morning (Not included on the hotel bill)	.92
Tips	1.00
One meal on train	5.00
TOTAL	$43.65

I enclose receipts for the breakfast and for the Pullman.

With all best wishes and much appreciation.

Yours sincerely,

Frank H. H. King
Acting Chairman
East Asian Studies

FHHK:bas

Enclosures

INDIANA UNIVERSITY
BLOOMINGTON, INDIANA 47401

INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
BALLANTINE HALL

AREA CODE 812
TEL. NO. 337-5565

February 5, 1965

Miss Eloise ReQua
Director, Library of International Relations
660 North Wabash Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60611

Dear Miss ReQua:

Thank you very much for the transcript. As you see, I haven't changed even one word. My lack of loquaciousness is not a personality trait but rather the feeling that, possibly, you had the wrong man at the conference. I was personally immensely stimulated by the discussion. I don't know of any conference that I have attended that was quite so profitable as a learning experience. As a silent friend of mine justifies himself: "When I'm talking, I don't learn nothing." I just kept quiet and learned considerably.

Since I thought that the conference was so profitable, I have suggested to George Stolnitz and to Fred Riggs that Indiana make a bid to host this group at an early date. Do you think your executive committee might be interested in this? If so, I would think that we could find such resources as might be necessary to sponsor the group.

I am sending you a syllabus for a new course that I am giving this spring in Development Administration. You might find it interesting. Again, thank you for your many kind services while in Chicago.

Sincerely,

Roy Randall

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Chairman

Philip M. Hauser
Department of Sociology
University of Chicago

Leonard Binder
Department of Political Science
University of Chicago

George I. Blanksten
Department of Political Science
Northwestern University

Wesley Fishel
Department of Political Science
Michigan State University

Norton S. Ginsburg
Department of Geography
University of Chicago

Bert F. Hoselitz
Research Center on Economic
Development and Cultural Change
University of Chicago

George J. Stolnitz
Department of Economics
Indiana University

Sister Thomasine
Department of Economics
Rosary College

Andrew Whiteford
Department of Anthropology
Beloit College

Secretary

Eloise ReQua, Director
Library of International Relations

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES ON PARTICIPANTS

C. ARNOLD ANDERSON

Director, Comparative Education Center, and Professor of Education and of Sociology, University of Chicago; Education Specialist on World Bank mission to Kenya; Fulbright Professor at Uppsala, Sweden.

ROBERT P. ARMSTRONG

Instructor in Economics department, Lake Forest College; in Liberia 1961-62 as Research Associate, Northwestern University Economic Survey of Liberia; travel in twelve countries in the Middle East and Far East to study practices, problems, and prospects concerning economic development, 1962-63; author of chapters in Economic Survey of Liberia, Northwestern University, 1962; associate author of Puerto Rican Shipping and the U.S. Maritime Laws: An Economic Appraisal, The Transportation Center, Northwestern University, 1964.

JACK BARANSON

Research Associate, International Development Research Center, Indiana University, since November, 1962; research staff member, Committee for Economic Development; research associate, Brookings Institution; participant in an economic development mission to Latin America; author of various studies and articles on industrialization and economic development in Latin America and other underdeveloped areas.

LEONARD BINDER

Associate Professor of Political Science, University of Chicago since 1961; research on comparative politics, particularly in developing nations and on Near Eastern and Middle Eastern politics and Islamic culture; author of Religion and Politics in Pakistan, Iran: Political Development in a Changing Society, and several articles.

GEORGE I. BLANKSTEN

Professor, Department of Political Science, Northwestern University; Political Analyst, U.S. Department of State, 1944-46; with U.S. Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, 1942-44; research and field experience in Latin American countries, 1950-59; author of books and articles on Latin American culture and politics, e.g. Argentina and Chile, U.S. Role in Latin America, and Perón's Argentina.

KARL DE SCHWEINITZ, JR.

Professor of Economics, Northwestern University; in Japan 1963-64 to study economic development and political change; author of Industrialization and Democracy.

A. A. FATOUROS

Assistant Professor, School of Law, Indiana University; Lecturer and Assistant Professor, Faculty of Law, University of Western Ontario, 1960-63; visiting Assistant Professor, Law School, University of Chicago, 1963-64; author of Government Guarantees to Foreign Investors, 1962, and articles in legal and political science journals.

NORTON SYDNEY GINSBURG

Professor of Geography, University of Chicago, and Associate Dean of The College; member, United Nations Technical Mission to Japan on Metropolitan Planning; Consultant to Calcutta Metropolitan Planning Organization; author of Atlas of Economic Development, co-author of Malaya and The Pattern of Asia and numerous other books and articles.

PHILIP S. HARING

Associate Professor of Political Science, Knox College, Galesburg, Illinois; field: Political Theory, Comparative Government, Economic Theory.

JAMES B. HENDRY

Director, Economic and Agricultural Development Institute, and Associate Professor, Department of Economics and Agricultural Economics, Michigan State University; member, Harvard University Pakistan Advisory Group, 1962-64; Economist with Michigan State Viet Nam Advisory Group, 1957-59; author of The Small World of Khanh Hau, and The Work Force in Saigon.

H. MURRAY HERLIHY

Professor of Economics and Chairman, Department of Economics, Lake Forest College; industrial and labor relations specialist; co-author of Issues in Railroad Retirement.

ROBERT T. HOLT

Professor of Political Science, University of Minnesota; Research Assistant, Center of International Studies, Princeton University, 1951-52; Research Assistant, ONR Project, Research in Cohesive and Disruptive Tendencies in Coalition Type Groups, University of Minnesota, 1952; author of various articles on psychological and political aspects of foreign affairs; co-author of Strategic Psychological Operations and American Foreign Policy; author of The Political Basis of Economic Growth: An Explanation in Comparative Political Analysis, to be published 1965, and others.

SCOTT D. JOHNSTON

Professor and Head of Department of Political Science, Hamline University; Director, Falk Foundation Program in Politics; Coordinator, four-college Far East Area Study Program; Faculty Representative, Washington Semester Program; research in North Africa and the Middle East; author of various articles.

FRANK HENRY HAVILAND KING

Associate Professor in Economics and member of Committee for East Asian Studies, University of Kansas; Acting Director, Center for East Asian Studies; author of The New Malayan Nation, The Monetary System of Hong Kong, and numerous articles and other books on money and finance in the Far East.

MORDECHAI E. KREININ

Professor of Economics, Michigan State University; Editorial Collaborator, Journal of the American Statistical Association; Consultant to Council on Foreign Relations; author of Israel and Africa, a Study in Technical Cooperation and numerous articles in professional journals and collections.

W. ARTHUR LEWIS

Professor of Economics and International Affairs, Princeton University; Professor of Political Economy, University of Manchester, 1948-58; member U.N. Group of Experts on Under-developed Countries, 1951; member Colonial Development Corporation, 1951-53; consultant to U.N. Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, 1952; Consultant to Gold Coast Government, 1953; consultant to Government

of West Nigeria, 1955; Economic Advisor to Prime Minister of Ghana, 1957-58; Principal and Vice-Chancellor, University College of the West Indies, 1959-62; articles in technical, economic, and law journals; author of Industrial Development in the Caribbean, The Principles of Economic Planning, Theory of Economic Growth; co-author of U.N. Report, "Measures for the Economic Development of Under-developed Countries", and other books and articles.

MARVIN P. MIRACLE

Assistant Professor of Agricultural Economics, University of Wisconsin; research experience in Belgian Congo, British East Africa, Northern Rhodesia, and other developing areas, principally in Africa; author of articles in professional journals and collections on African agricultural problems.

THEODORE MORGAN

Professor of Economics, University of Wisconsin; Consultant, Council of Economic Advisers; Chairman, Wisconsin - Ford Foundation Project, Gadjah Mada University, Jogjakarta, Indonesia, 1959-60; consultant to International Bank for Reconstruction and Development as member of Mission to Kenya, 1961-62; Deputy-Governor, Central Bank of Ceylon, 1952-53; co-author of The Economic Development of Kenya and Readings in Economic Development, and author of other books and numerous articles.

MANNING NASH

Associate Professor of Anthropology, Graduate School of Business, University of Chicago; Editor, "Economic Development and Cultural Change" since 1958; research in Mexico and Burma; author of Machine Age Maya, and several articles.

RAYMOND L. RANDALL

Acting Director, Institute of Public Administration and Associate Professor of Government, Indiana University; formerly Chief of Party, Indiana-Indonesian Contract, Djakarta, Indonesia; Ford Visiting Professor of Public Administration, University of the Philippines; Adviser to the Philippine Government on the Philippine Executive Academy; Executive Development Adviser to the Government of Thailand; author of brochures and articles on executive development for "Nation's Business," and other publications.

HUGH H. SCHWARTZ

Acting Assistant Professor of Economics, The University of Kansas; Organization of American States research fellowship in Argentina, 1960-62; author of articles on Argentina.

HAL SERRIE

Instructor in Anthropology, Beloit College; Project Associate, developing use of solar cookers in Oaxaca, Mexico, 1961-62; directed two films in Mexico, 1962-63; taught English at University of Aleppo, Syria, 1963-64.

SISTER THOMASINE

Professor of Economics, Rosary College; research in the Middle East, Central and South America; author of various pamphlets and articles.

CHARLES PRESTON WARREN

Instructor in Anthropology, University of Illinois, Chicago Undergraduate Division; Fulbright Award, Research Scholar, anthropological research in the Philippine Islands; author of The Batak of Palawan: A Culture in Transition and numerous articles and papers.

EDWARD WERNER

Professor of Commerce, The University of Wisconson; Director, Center for Developing Nations, Assistant to the Dean of International Studies, and Secretary of Faculty Committee on Research and Services to Developing Areas; taught at Gadjah Mada University, Jogjakarta, Indonesia, 1960-63; Chairman of University of Wisconsin team advising Indonesian Government on their economic education program.

ANDREW H. WHITEFORD

Professor of Anthropology and Director, Logan Museum of Anthropology, Beloit College; community research in Popayán, Colombia, 1949-52 and 1962; urban survey of Central Mexico, 1956; study of culture change in Malaga, Spain, 1961; editor of Teaching Anthropology, and author of Two Cities of Latin America and numerous articles.

T. DAVID WILLIAMS

Lecturer in Economics, Northwestern University; research associate, Center for Studies in Development and Education, Harvard University, 1962-64; Lecturer in Economics, University of Ghana, 1961-62.

DANIEL WIT

Professor of Political Science, Northern Illinois University; Public Administration Advisor to Government of Thailand and Visiting Professor, Institute of Public Administration, Bangkok, 1956-58; Peace Corps Lecturer for Malaya and the Philippines training programs, 1961; contract research on Thailand for U. S. Department of Labor, 1963-64; author of numerous monographs and articles.